

Cyril of Alexandria, Five Tomes Against Nestorius Pt 2

The Word after the Union One Incarnate Person. Similitudes of unlike things united. ' Connection ' does not unite. The Name Christ means God the Son Incarnate. Jacob's pillar a type. To His human nature belong the anointing and His subjection to the Law: yet He is God. Cyrus how christ, the Babylonians how holy. Personal Union. Christ's glory no imparted glory but His own inherent glory. If community of names unite, Emmanuel has nought more than we. The human cannot be allotted to a distinct person. God the Son incarnate to be worshipped just as before His Incarnation. Speak not of 'hidden' and 'manifest' as though Two, they are One. Worship of Him taught by God the Father.

The tongue is a fire and an unruly evil, as it is written; thrusting from him the mischief therefrom, the Divine-uttering David says, *Set a watch, O Lord, before my mouth, a door of fencing around my lips, incline not mine heart to words of wickedness.* For to be able to speak aright, and to have an exact control over the tongue, as to what it should speak, what not, is of a truth God-given, and is no slight matter with those who practise a conversation not void of admiration. But recklessness in speech and unbridled licence unto trickery, are replete with danger and bear down to *the pit-fall of hell* those who use it. And it is written, *Death and life are in the hand of the tongue, they that master it shall eat the fruits thereof.* A certain other too of the wise men hath said to us, *If thou hast a word of understanding, answer, if not, lay thine hand upon thy mouth;* for how is not silence better than unlearned speech? But accursed is it in another way too to belch forth bitter words, and to heap down sinful sayings upon the ineffable Glory, albeit it ought to be honoured by us with unceasing praises. And when we sin against the brethren and wound their weak conscience, we sin against Christ, for so hath written the Divine-uttering Paul.

And this I say having read Nestorius' words and observing that he not only says that we ought not to say that the holy Virgin is Mother of God and that she hath borne Emmanuel Who is God, but yet in addition to this and in many ways is he minded to make war upon the glory of Christ. For he endeavours to shew us that He is God-bearing and not truly God, but man associated with God; as in equality of rank. For thus seems good to him alone apart from every one else, to think and to speak, albeit the Catholic Church, which Christ Himself presented to Himself, has not the wrinkles of him who has compiled such things, but rather as unblemished, she keeps wholly without rebuke her knowledge of Him, and hath made full well her tradition of the Faith. For we believe in One God, the Father Almighty, of all things both visible and invisible the Maker, and in One Lord Jesus the Christ, and in the Holy Ghost: and following the confessions annexed hereto of the holy Fathers, we say that the Very Word Essentially sprung from forth God the Father, was made as we and was Incarnate and made Man, that is, took to Himself a Body from forth the holy Virgin, and made it His Own: for thus will He be truly One Lord Jesus Christ, thus let us worship Him as One, not putting apart Man and God, but believing that He is One and the Same, in Godhead and in Manhood, that is, God alike and Man.

But the inventor of the most recent impiety, albeit making feint of saying One Christ, ever divides the Natures and sets Each by itself, saying that they did not truly come together; but making excuses in sins, as it is written, devises some mode of connection, of merely (as I said) equality of rank, as shall be shewn from his own words: and he makes the Word out of God indwell by participation, as in a common man, and distributes the sayings in the Gospels, so as one while to attribute certain to the Word alone and by Himself, other while to him that

is born from forth a woman separately. Yet how is it not obvious to all that the Only-Begotten being God by Nature has been made man, not by connection simply (as *he* says) considered as external or accidental, but by true union, ineffable and passing understanding. And thus He is conceived of as One and Only, and every thing said befits Him and all will be said of One Person. For the Incarnate Nature of the Word Himself is after the Union now conceived of as One, just as will reasonably be conceived in regard to ourselves too, for man is really One, compounded of unlike things, soul I mean and body. But it is necessary now too to notify that we say that the Body united to God the Word is ensouled with a reasonable Soul. And I will for profit's sake add this too: other than the Word out of God is the flesh, in regard to its proper nature, other again Essentially the Nature of the Word Itself. But even though the things named be conceived of as diverse and sundered in diverseness of nature, yet is Christ conceived of as One out of both, the Godhead and manhood having come together one to another in true union.

And the God-inspired Scripture confirms us hereto by ten thousand words and acts: using similitudes whereby one may (and that without labour) clearly advance so as we may behold the Mystery of Christ. The blessed Prophet Isaiah said therefore, *And there was sent to me one of the Seraphim and in his hand a live coal which he had taken with the tongs from off the altar and he touched my mouth and said, Lo this hath touched thy lips and shall take away thine iniquities and purge thy sins.* And searching according to our power into the depth of the vision, we say that none other save our Lord Jesus Christ is the spiritual coal laid on the altar whereon by us it gives forth the sweet savour of incense to God the Father: for *through Him have we had access* and are acceptable, offering the spiritual worship. This Divine Coal therefore, when it touches the lips of him who approaches thereto, will straightway exhibit 'him pure and wholly imparticipate in any sin. And in what way it touches our lips, the blessed Paul will teach saying, *Nigh thee is the word, in thy mouth and in thy heart, that if thou say with thy mouth Lord Jesus and believe in thy heart that God hath raised, Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved, for with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.* And He is compared to a Coal, because conceived of as from two unlike things, yet by a true concurrence they are all but knit together unto union. For the fire entering into the wood, will transelement it somehow into its own glory and might albeit it hath retained what it was.

Our Lord Jesus Christ again likens Himself to a Pearl, saying, *The kingdom of heaven is like unto a merchant man seeking goodly pearls, who when he had found one Pearl of great price hath gone and sold all that he had and bought it.* I hear Him in another way manifesting Himself to us and saying, I am *the flower of the plain, the lily of the valleys.* For He has in His Proper Nature the God-befitting Brightness of God the Father, and gives forth again His Saviour, in respect I mean of spiritual fragrance. As therefore in the pearl and also the lily, the thing itself is conceived of as body, the brilliancy or fragrance therein considered in its proper definition as other than they in whom they are, yet are the things inseparably innate again the own properties and not alien from those which possess them:---- in this way (I deem) shall we both reason and think of Emmanuel too. For of diverse kind by nature are Godhead and flesh, yet was the Body of the Word His own, and not severed from His Body is the Word which is united thereto; for thus and not otherwise will Emmanuel, i.e., God with us, be conceived of. Hence one while as Man, and making Himself manifest to us from the measures of the emptiness too, He said, *No man takes My life from Me,* another while again conceived of as God the Word and out of Heaven and One with His proper flesh, He says, *No man hath ascended up to Heaven but He That came down from Heaven, the Son of Man.*

The Holy Scripture therefore from every side knitting together unto inseverable and true union the Son and bearing us back in faith unto One Person, this extraordinary man manifoldly severs, and hath babbled idly, calling the Word out of God the Father God of Christ Himself too, as our discourse as it advances will clearly demonstrate in its own time and place. For he feigns that he is afraid lest any overcome by reverence for the holy Virgin, and calling her Mother of God, should, supposing that there is a mixture and immingling of the Persons one with another pour forth uncomeliness upon the doctrines of the Church, albeit no one thus thinks: and rectifying (as he deems) a thing so dire, he utterly confuses all things, regardless of ideas which pertain to rightness and truth: for he said thus;

"If in simple faith you had been putting forward the word Mother of God, I would not have grudged it you, on examining the sense of the word. But since I see that you, on plea of honouring the blessed Mary, are maintaining the blasphemy of the heretics, I therefore ward off the putting forth of the word, suspecting the danger that is concealed therein. But to speak clearly and more intelligibly to all, it is the aim of the party of Arius and Eunomius and Apolinarius and of all who are of like brotherhood, to bring in Theotokus, as though, a mingling having taken place and the two natures not divided, nought of the meaner things were taken of the human nature, and they had place at length against the Divinity, as though all things were spoken of One, not in regard to the rank from connection, but to Nature. For One is Christ, and One Lord: but in respect of Christ, I mean of the Only-Begotten Son, both Christ and Son are said, one while, of the Godhead, another while of the Manhood and Godhead."

§1. Seest thou how with manifold inventions of ideas he impiously embellishes the generation after the flesh also of the Only-Begotten, how he essays to shew that it will take place no otherwise than by some infusion or commingling of the substances having place: albeit the Teachers of the Church do not initiate us this fashion; for we say that a true concurrence had place, the Word uniting to Himself the Body, yet abiding what He was. But this man taking nought of these things to mind, hath blasphemed in no mean degree, parting Him into two persons and hypostases wholly severed one from the other, and attributing to either separately the words to it belonging: and again he says One Lord Jesus Christ, as though man were connected with God by rank only, not by true Union i. e., by Nature. How then is He One Christ and Son and Lord, if to both severally will belong, as thou sayest, the being thus called and so being in truth, by reason of the hypostases coming together in no wise by union one with another, but being united in respect of rank only or sway or authority? And yet if we examine into the nature of things, we shall observe that things which are in equality of dignity, have not for this reason parted with their individual existence: nor yet will the having equal degree in point of glory, suffice to union, as for example, Peter and John were both of them Apostles and holy and adorned with equal honours and might through the Spirit by Christ the Saviour of us all. For they along with the rest heard, *Ye are the light of the world*, and again, *Heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, cast out devils*. Shall we therefore say that from their equality of rank or sway accrues to them that they too should be counted as one man, and this is sufficient for unity, I mean unity of their persons? And how will not such an opinion be with reason conceived of as foolish exceedingly? Why then dost thou feign that thou art right in the Faith, saying that One is Christ Jesus the Lord, and then, severing into two persona and hypostases the One, dishonourest the mode of the True Union through which the Christ is One and Alone, and unlearnedly callest equality of honour connection? What is this mode of connection? knowest thou not that dear it always is to those in this life who are rich in honours from the rulers to be in worldly renown? yet they being in.

equal dignity sometimes, are yet separate one from another in individual being and moreover in their desire of thinking and doing the same things. But if the kind of rank were any necessary bond gathering them into unity just like a physical coming together;----they would not, being in equality of honours or rank, have been parted one from another in persons and mind so as to be one and another. Where then shall we put thy *connection*, what shall we count that it wrought? did it persuade them to be of one league, did it cause that they should come together unto a mystic union? But you cannot say this, for reason has shewn that the connection is utterly weak to both these.

Tell me this too (for I will ask it as well, as matter of necessity), what good did the rank do for the man born from out a woman who was (as you said) connected with God the Word? for did it make him equal in glory and excellency, and render him as great as He too is believed to be? And how then will He not speak falsely saying, *My Glory will I not give to another*, and vainly hath the Divine-uttering Psalmist too prated, saying on this wise, *Who among the clouds shall be made equal to the Lord? who shall be made like to the Lord among the sons of God?* Is not he other than the Word, One and by Nature and forth of God the Father, who in his proper person has been verily parted from union with Him? and how is this not clear to all? Now rank has not made equal to God the Word that which was connected, but it is seen to be and is in lower place: how then dost thou say One Christ and Son and Lord, although one excels, at least according to the force of reasoning, the other settles down below equality with Him and glory? Besides (for I will add this too to what I said) the Word That is forth of God the Father has given (according to him) His proper rank to him that is born of a woman: but how he says that this very thing has been wrought, it is meet to examine. Has he too been made Very Light? is he by Nature God and Life and Creator and Wisdom and Might, *Image and Brightness of the Person* of the Father? and the Endowments of the Supreme Glory, have they passed Naturally into some one of things made? what then is the Excellence in God by Nature? what great and above us, if it is possible for the creature to be rich and that essentially, in the good things wherein Itself is? But perchance it has been clad in rank, as participant of the Divine Preeminence? there are again two undoubted sons, if it is true that something other and inferior by nature to Him Who wrought in him the participation is that which is honoured with relationship to Him: you are therefore caught now as not even knowing what you are saying. For why do you blame those who attribute the words in the Gospels to One Person? is it not because you are inventing two sons? for how is there any longer One Lord and Christ and Son, if each have his proper person and mode of being and moreover hypostasis withdrawing unto diverse-ness, repudiating the reality of true union and having utter irreconcilability with the other? And what is strange and shews the loathsomeness of his blasphemies, he says that the names are common. I mean Son and Christ and Lord. And if he say that they are common, i. e., to One Christ and to others besides Him, his statement would have probability: but if he ignorantly sever and supposes that these terms befit the Word by Himself and moreover him that is forth of a woman, there are again surely and unmistakably two christs and sons and lords. For he said, "The name Christ must one while be put for the Godhead Itself, other while for the Manhood too, or also for both." But the community of name will help him not a whit to conceive of one Christ and Son and Lord while he severs (even though the hypostases themselves part not one from another), and the Persons are disjoined in their own proper diverseness.

For making manifest to us the force of his innate unlearning he subjoins and says,

"When therefore the Divine Scripture is about to speak of either the birth of Christ which was forth of the blessed Virgin, or His Death, it is never seen to put God, but either Christ or Son or Lord, seeing that these three are significant of the two natures, one while of this, other while of that, other while of this and that. As for example when the Scripture declares to us the Generation out of man, what says it? God sent forth His Son; it did not say, God sent forth God the Word, but it takes the name which indicates the two natures. For since the Son is Man and God, it says, Sent forth His Son made from out a woman, that when you hear the word made out of a woman, then you may see the name put forth which indicates the two natures, that you may call the Birth from forth the blessed Virgin, the Son's Birth, for the Virgin mother of Christ too bare the Son of God. But since the Son of God is two-fold in His Natures, she bare indeed the Son of God, but bare the manhood which is son by reason of the connected Son."

§2. But WE my friend, who know how to think better than thine empty whistlings and who track out the order of the God-inspired Scripture which says that *One is God the Father out of whom are all things and One Lord Jesus Christ through Whom* all things were brought into being: when we hear that Christ has been born of the holy Virgin, then, then in all wisdom and zealous to go the straight way of the Truth, do we say that the Word Which sprang forth of God the Father was both Incarnate and united Personally to flesh and born after the flesh: and we will not endure thy trickery, but to One and Only, the Son That is by Nature, will we allot the name Christ, with reason, when the Birth through the holy Virgin is spoken of. For common (as I said) to Him with others also will such names confessedly "be, for many are sons by grace and *gods and lords both in heaven and in earth*, as the Divine-uttering Paul too writes to us: yet [they are so] as participating with Him Who is so by Nature and in imitation [of Him]. Still the name Christ and its reality will pertain in no wise to the bare Word from forth the Father, conceived of by us as bare [Word] by Himself and apart from flesh: but if now He be said to have emptied Himself and to have come down [to be] in servant's form and been made as we by reason of the flesh, He too will be called by reason of the anointing, Christ; for not in His own Nature has the Word being God been Anointed, but the anointing hath happened to Him in regard to His Humanity. Thus therefore when that has first entered in, in regard to which the anointing takes place (for His is the Incarnation whereto belongs the anointing), when Christ is named by us we will not (according to thy unbridled speech) suppose that just a man, severed from the Word and put apart, has been born of the holy Virgin but the very Word (as I said) out of God the Father united to flesh and anointed humanly *with the oil of gladness* by God the Father.

But that the anointing hath happened to God the Word in respect of the manhood, when He became as we, holy Scripture will prove to us; for the Divine-uttering Jacob departing from his father's hearth was hastening on his way unto Mesopotamia and going to Laban the son of Bethuel, and having *lighted on a certain place* on the way thither he was lodging there and, laying his head on a stone, he sleeps: and having seen a ladder, stretching on high from earth to heaven and angels both ascending and descending by means of it and the Lord resting thereupon, he marvelled much at the vision and taking the stone he *set it up as a pillar and poured oil upon the top of it*. Regard now herein our Lord Jesus Christ, the One and only and truly Son, as a pillared stone. For indeed He is *a choice stone, a head corner-stone, precious, set for the head of the corner and for the foundation of Zion* by God the Father. Regard (I pray) moreover how it was anointed, for not the whole stone throughout did the Divine-uttering Jacob bedew with oil, but rather poured it *upon the top of it*. Therefore not wholly (so to speak) nor in that the Only-Begotten is Word, has He been anointed in

respect of His proper Nature (for how could He be conceived of as participate of His own Spirit?) but rather is anointed (as I said) on the surface, i. e., externally and as in part and on the surface on the Body that was His own by true union: and as He is said to *suffer in the flesh* humanly, albeit by Nature Impassible as God; so is He conceived of as anointed in regard to the human nature, albeit Himself anointing with His own Spirit those whom it befits to partake of His holiness.

Thus are WE minded to think and are accustomed to walk aright, going on the royal and unperverted road: but *he* saying that such names are indicative of the two natures, allots to either with authority what seems good to him and is ashamed of the lowliness of speech belonging to the economy with flesh, and though you hear the blessed Paul say, *God sent forth His Son made from out a woman, made under the law*, Away, says this man, think not that the Word Which sprang forth of God has been sent, for He has not been made from out a woman, He has not been made under the law.

And that our words are no empty guile, but we have used rather his own speech, I will again bring forward the very things he said,

"For *God* (he says) *sent forth His Son made of a woman, if made under the law*. Here he points out the two natures, he says what took place as to the human nature, for demand of the wrangler, Who was *made under the law*? was it God the Word?"

§3. And how will not he be verily distraught, who essays to overturn, as far as in him lies, things so clear and known of all and undoubted? Whom hath the Father sent to us out of heaven, Saviour and Redeemer? was it not the Word Which sprang forth of His Essence? Who is He *That descended and ascended far above the Heavens that He might fill all things*? Dost thou say that the being able to *fill all things* is the work of our nature and will you affix it to the measures of humanity? of whom hath the blessed John written, *He that cometh from above is above all*? Or will haply Himself too lie in rebuking the people of the Jews and saying, *Ye are from beneath, I am from above*, and again, *I am not of this world*? For if He were man out of woman like one of the rest, and not rather the Word That is from above and out of God the Father, Incarnate and appearing in human form, how will He be conceived of as both *above* and out of heaven? how *above all* and *not of this world*? albeit a part of the world by reason of the flesh and (so to speak), according to the measure that befits the human nature, made along with all under God. Therefore He called the Father His God, though He too is God by Nature and beamed forth out of His Essence Only-Begotten Son. Of whom says the blessed David, *He sent forth His Word and healed them? for no elder, no angel but the Lord Himself hath saved us*, according to the Scriptures.

"*But yea, he saith, God the Word able to fill all things has been sent. How? for where do we say that He is not? or whither will He be sent?*"

Will you accuse therefore the all-wise Moses too, as having wronged in no slight degree the Ineffable glory of God? for he said that *God descended in the form of fire upon the Mount Sinai*. And if you hear the blessed David say unto God mighty over all, *Thou shalt send forth Thy Spirit and they shall be created and Thou shalt renew the face of the earth*, wilt thou then perchance put aside the Spirit-clad and suppose that he speaks falsely? for no motion involving change of place does the Godhead make, nor will It pass from place to place, as though the being in all and filling all things were not inherent in It. These things

(I suppose).....thyself too; but you will be reasoning again, and rising up against the true doctrines, choosing to follow yourself alone. But you would surely have better thoughts if you reasoned thus, that our whole speech as to God has been framed in human wise, but is understood as befits Him Alone.

But it has troubled him not a little that the Word out of God the Father is said to have been *made under the Law*. But the fear herein is nought, for He hath remained what He was, Lawgiver (that is) and God. And if He have not been made man, He hath not been made under the Law; but since it is true that He hath humbled Himself Who in His own Nature is above and high, hath been made as we Who is above the whole creation, and *being Rich became poor* through being made as we, how will He not be said with us to have been *made under the Law* too? Shall we not, if we think aright, conclude that the measure of man's nature is defined to lie in his having to be subject to the Law? for the exempt and above the Law and by Nature and in truth free will be none other than the Godhead. Hence when He was made flesh then was He made under the Law too, for He paid to the collectors the didrachm, albeit in His own Nature Free as God and Son even when He was made flesh. But if to thee it seems good to sever into two the One and to declare to us that he which was forth of a woman is man apart by himself, how will he be said to have been made under the Law too, who is of the nature which is under the Law? for not that which hath to be subject to the Law, will be *made under the Law*, but that which, hath a Nature above Law and external to Law. For the Divine and Most High Nature alone (as I said) is both beyond law and also free, and hath no master whatever, but Itself rather ruleth all and subjecteth all to His own yoke.

But this man having missed right reasoning, slid down to this extent of impiety in his ideas and arrived at such height of awkwardness, from dividing into two the One Lord Jesus Christ, as unshrinkingly to say that Emmanuel is neither truly God nor yet by Nature Son, but is so called Christ and holy, as certain other too of men like us or of those who have worshipped impure devils: for thus again hath he said:

"But as we say that the Creator of all is God and Moses god; for it says, I have made thee a god unto Pharaoh: and Israel God's son, for it says, Israel is My firstborn son; and as we say that Saul was christ, for it says, I will not stretch forth my hand upon him, because he is the Lord's christ, and Cyrus likewise, Thus saith the Lord to Cyrus My christ, and the Babylonian holy, for I (it says) marshal them so do we say that the Lord is christ and god and son and holy. But the community of names is similar, the rank not the same."

§4. What are you saying? what word are you belching forth *out of your own heart and not out of the mouth of the Lord*, as it is written? No one *callesth Jesus Anathema* save in Beelzebub. As Moses for instance may be conceived of or called by us God, so will Christ too? after the likeness of Israel, will He too be Son, tell me? O impiety! O words that reck not of lifting up themselves against the glory of our Saviour! O sheer stupidity! and that overcomes all hesitancy in respect I mean of unholy daring against the doctrines of the Church. Let the blessed David now too sing, *The enemies of the Lord lied unto Him*: for the Divine-uttering Moses was by nature a man as we and nought else: but when on God saying, *Come I am sending thee to Pharaoh king of Egypt and thou shalt bring the children of Israel forth of the land of Egypt*, he was putting forward as reason for begging off, his slowness of speech and want of utterance, *since yesterday and the third day*, he heard God say, *See I have made thee a god to Pharaoh and Aaron thy brother shall be thy interpreter*. For feeble was the law to rid any from bondage unto the devil, but on Christ becoming our Mediator, this too has been

achieved, just as here when Aaron was along with the Divine-uttering Moses, Israel was delivered from the bondage in Egypt. But since Christ was about in due course of time to be made under the Law too, in that He was as we and was man, Aaron was put in second place to Moses. And the plan of the mystery is thus,----but if one should choose to say this too, that by the calling of God has that mighty Moses too been honoured, according to this which has been said to us in common and as by God's favour and munificence, *I said, Ye are gods and all of you sons of the Most High:---*is Christ in this way God? yet how is not this madness and the empty froth of an unlearned mind? for the one (as I said) being man by nature has been honoured with the mere title only, the Other is truly God (for the Word was God) in human form, having the preeminence over all of His own Nature unmutated (for not in change for the worse will be the Divine Nature by reason of Its descending to communicate in blood and flesh), and verily He is recognized as God when appearing as Man also. And a clear demonstration of this are the things that have been written in the Gospels concerning Him. For the Divine-uttering John said, *Now when He was in Jerusalem in the feast, many believed in His Name when they saw the miracles which He was doing, but Jesus Himself did not trust Himself to them, because He knew all things and needed not that any one should testify of man, for He knew what was in man:* albeit the being able to see the heart of man and to know its secrets, will not belong to any one (whence should it?) of men like us, nor yet to ought other of things made, but rather to Him Alone Who is said to *fashion our hearts by Himself*. Then how has Emmanuel, being called God, been honoured like Moses with the mere title alone, and is not rather in truth that which He is also said to be? Thus again does John write of Him, *for He whom God sent speaketh the words of God and giveth not the Spirit by measure*. Understandest thou then how, albeit beheld a man as we, *He speaketh the words of God?* For to God Alone Who is by Nature and truly will pertain as something choice and above the creature, the being able by a word to achieve what He will and to render partakers of the Holy Ghost them who have been justified in faith:----and one may see that Christ is in this case. For He said to the leper, *I will, be clean*. to the widow's son, *Young man, to thee say I, Arise:* and His own Disciples He manifested partakers of the Holy Ghost, for *He breathed on them, saying, Receive ye the Holy Ghost*. Then how will He Who has advanced to this point and been crowned with God-befitting renown be god after such sort as was Moses? whose heart knew he? who hath believed on his name? whom hath he justified through faith in himself? where hath he as son spoken the words of God? albeit he hath openly cried unto them of Israel, *Thus saith the Lord*, and hath a servant's measure, for he was made *faithful as a servant in the house of God*.

And if Emmanuel was son in the same way too as was Israel who was made so after the flesh, thou hast brought down among bondservants Him Who is in His own Nature Free, even though He became in the form of a bondman by reason of the flesh and the things thereto pertaining: thou hast set in equal measure with the sons by grace Him on account of whom they have been enriched with the grace of sonship: for He has been called first-born of us by reason of the manhood, yet even so hath remained Only-begotten as God. ¹⁵Therefore (as saith the most wise Paul) the powers above are bidden to *worship the First-begotten* when introduced by the Father *into the world*, and on learning the mystery regarding Him, with ceaseless praises do they extol the One and by Nature and truly Son. For if He gives *authority* to them that *received Him to become children of God*, as John saith, and if it is true that His Spirit effects that we too should become sons (for *God sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts crying Abba, Father*), none who are accustomed to think aright will endure this man saying that He too is son in such manner as was Israel.

And how was He in such wise too christ and holy, as may be called christ both Cyrus the King of the Persians and yet again the Persians and Medes themselves? for it were time to say that neither has Christ been sanctified humanly albeit the Holy Ghost soared down upon Him in form of a dove. For Cyrus son of Cambyses led an expedition against the land of the Babylonians in his time, but he was in error, and used to offer worship to fowl devils: but when, on God stirring him up and rousing him into wrath, he took the land of the Babylonians, by a name common, albeit not anointed with the Holy Ghost, he was called christ. And in this way were the Persians and Medes holy who were his fellows (for they too *served the creature more than God the Creator* and worshipped the works of their own hands); but since the offering that was once, according to the words of the Mosaic Law, separated unto God, whether calf or sheep, was called holy; therefore have they too been called holy through the Prophet's voice, by reason they were set apart by the Divine assent to take captive the land of the Babylonians. If then Emmanuel is in such sort christ as was Cyrus too, and in such wise holy as were the Medes and Persians, one might with reason say as of their absurdity of notion that neither hath He been anointed with the Holy Ghost nor is He holy at all. The Divine David will therefore lie saying unto Him, *Thou lovedst righteousness and hatedst wrong, therefore God, Thy God, anointed Thee with the oil of gladness above Thy fellows.*

And he chattering after this sort against the Preeminence and glory of our Saviour, thinks that he thrusts away the charge of impiety, by saying something childish and without understanding, "for the community (he says) of names is like, not the rank the same." How, tell me, for I do not understand? For if He is in such wise God as was Moses too, and in such wise son as was Israel, and in such wise christ as was Cyrus and moreover in such wise holy as were the Medes, how will He escape having to be in equality of rank with them?

Now therefore you will be caught in having blasphemed against the very Nature of the Word too, for thou saidst again,

"Say of Him Who assumed that He is God, add of that which is assumed that it is the servant's form, bring in next the dignity of connection, that of the two the sway is common, that of the two the dignity is the same; while the natures remain, acknowledge the union of rank."

§5. He divides therefore again into two, in exceeding lack of understanding he lavishes on rank the force of union, haply not understanding what union is, and what the rank really is. But this we say; he said that of the two natures one is the sway, one the Dignity. Since then he who is in equality of glory with God the Word will not surpass Moses in respect of being god, it is I suppose clear that the very Word which is forth of God, will have equal status in nature and glory with Moses, for if the mean be like and in every respect have exact resemblance with the first and third, the plan of their nature will not be diverse.

But haply he will say that the mode of rank is not nature: how therefore do you deem it fit to gather into one (as yourself say) sway and to crown with equal rank things essentially so far severed from participation one with another and also from equality? for where a nature is wholly in inferior place, the other overtopping it, how will there accrue to it both equality of honours and even dignity and the mode of glory be not diverse?

But that on mentioning connection, haply conceived of as that of mere proximity and juxtaposition, or as an accidental one, himself rises up against his own words, building what he undid and setting up what has been overthrown, will be clear by this again also: for he said thus;

"Therefore I would have you hold fast with all assurance: there is no severance of the connection of the dignity of the sonship, there is no severance of his being Christ, of the Godhead and Manhood there is a severance; Christ is indivisible, in that He is Christ, for we have not two christs nor two sons, for there is not with us a first and a second, nor yet other and other, nor again another son and another again; but the One is Himself twofold, not in rank but in nature."

§6. Tell me again what it is you term inseverable connection: is it the union, I mean in respect of Person, which WE set forth, striving together for the doctrines of the Truth? or is it this which is conceived of as one of juxtaposition and proximity of any to anything? for thus does the God-inspired Scripture take the word. And verily He spake to the most holy Moses, when He was discoursing with him respecting that olden tabernacle, *And thou shalt make fifty taches of gold and connect the curtains one to other with the taches*. For being five and each having individually the being other than the rest, they were connected by the taches. But not thus do WE say that the union has been wrought as to Christ, for neither as one may be connected with another, either in respect to like mindedness or bodily nearness, was He too like this, but (as I have repeatedly said) He made His own the Body which was taken from forth the holy Virgin; and we say that the Word out of God has been truly united to flesh not without a soul.

Hence if the force of the connection which has been spoken of by him, signify the union which we mean, i. e. of Person, reasonably will he have said that there is no severance of Christ, in that He is Christ; for He is "not one and another, nor yet son and son, other and other, first and second," but One both before flesh and with flesh: for thus will He be in respect of rank (as THOU sayest) and also of sway, inseverable, yea rather the Same. Then how dost thou say that the One and Inseverable is twofold, and that not in regard of rank but of nature? for not because the Word out of God the Father having taken flesh, proceeded forth man as we, will He for this reason be called also twofold, for One and that not without flesh is He Who is in His proper Nature external to flesh and body.¹⁷ For as, were one to kill a man such as we are, he would not with reason be accused of having wronged two men but one alone, even though the man be conceived of as being of soul and body, and the nature of the things that have been brought together be not the same, but diverse: so again must we conceive of Christ, for He is not twofold, but One and Only Lord and Son is the Word from forth God the Father, not without flesh. For that of Manhood and Godhead most vast is the difference or interval I myself too would allow, for other in respect of the mode of their being and nothing like one to another are plainly the things which have been named. But when the mystery Christ-ward is brought before us, the plan of the union ignores not indeed the difference, but puts aside the severance, not confounding the natures or immingling them but, because the Word of God when He partook of flesh and blood, even thus is conceived of and called One Son. But you in saying that they ought not to be called two christs, nor should one confess two sons, and hereby filching the semblance of rightness in dogma, are caught in the act of saying two christs, and dividing into his own diverseness man and God, and you endeavour to shew that the one is operated, the other operates: for your words are thus,

"The good glory of the Only-Begotten one while is ascribed to the Father, for *it is*, He says, *My Father which glorifieth Me*, other while to the Spirit, for *the Spirit of Truth*, He says, *shall glorify Me*, other while to the power of Christ, for *they*, it says, *went forth and preached the word everywhere, the Lord co-working and confirming the word through the signs that followed.*"

§7. If he says that the Only-Begotten Word of God, as though lacking glory in that He is and is conceived of as Word and not yet Incarnate, is glorified by the Father and the Holy Ghost:--- that he both blunders and has missed the truth, I will leave saying for the present (for occasion leads us to something else); but he seems to me to have forgotten what he had just now thought out and said, for he said, "Not one and another is Christ, not other and other son, for we have not two Christs and two sons." But, O most understanding, would I say, if thou affirm that the good glory of the Only-Begotten is ascribed to the power of Christ, how will He be not one and another, or how not wholly and surely two? for if not the same be giver and receiver, or he ascribe to another than himself the things which accrue to him by nature, Christ hath wrought being possessed, as being other than the Only-Begotten: for if the good glory of the Only-Begotten have been (as you say) ascribed to him; and the Divine-uttering disciples using the power that came from him, preached and wrought miracles, how is that not true that I said? for he hath wrought using other's power, that he which wrought and not himself rather may be glorified by those in the world. What then (tell me) appears there more in Him than in the holy Apostles? for they have wrought wonders not by their own power, and this themselves clearly confessed, for they were worthy of admiration in knowing this too and glorifying Him Who worketh in them. Then how ought not Christ Who according to thee was possessed by another and had from without the good glory of the Only-Begotten, to have proclaimed to those who approach Him as God, and supplicate succour from Him, In the name of the Only-Begotten, or in His Might, be to thee this good thing: for so used to do the all-wise disciples, every where naming Jesus of Nazareth. But to no one whatever hath He declared this, but rather to His own power used He to attribute what was accomplished, one time saying to the blind man, *Believe ye that I am able to do this?* and requiring their assent, at another ordering with authority saying, *I will, be clean.* Why dost thou not, letting go the fables fit for old women which have been invented by thyself alone, occupy thyself with wise mind about the depth of the mystery?

But one may see that he little reckes of things needful unto profit, but is afraid lest he let drop ought true and be caught thinking anything praiseworthy: and thinks every thing that is most discordant and makes a condemnation utterly inconsiderate of the doctrines of the church, albeit he should have remembered God saying by the mouth of Ezekiel to those who are over the spiritual flocks, *Ye ate the good pasture and drank the pure water and troubled the residue with your feet, and My flock fed on the treadings down of your feet and drank the water troubled by your feet.* For when WE apply our minds to the God-inspired Scriptures, we eat *the good pasture*, as it is written, and we drink the untroubled water, i. e. the unmixed with falsehood, translucent and most pure word of the Spirit: but if we thicken it and immingle therewith like mud the cheerlessness of our own devices, we plot against the flocks of the Saviour.

And that this too is true, the things which he has thought out and heedlessly said of Christ, will shew; for it is thus:

"For God the Word even before the Incarnation was Son and God and of one mind with the Father, but in the last times He took the form of a servant. Yet being before this Son, and being [so] called, after the assumption He cannot be called Son separately, lest we teach the doctrine of two sons. But since he has been connected with Him which is in the beginning Son, Him who was connected with him, he may not admit of severance in respect of the dignity of sonship, in respect I say of the dignity of sonship, not in respect of the natures. Wherefore God the Word is called Christ also, since He has His connection with Christ perpetual. And it is not possible that God the Word should do ought without the manhood, for it has been with all exactitude brought unto exact connection, not unto deification, as the wise ones of the neo-dogmatists say."

§8. He that durst say that the good glory of the Only-Begotten has been ascribed to the power of Christ, and that plucked asunder the bond of Oneness, gathers again into union and again dissolves it and parts the natures one from other. And most plentifully does he vainly talk and rhodomontade to us respecting these things, so that even though he should say ought that tendeth unto orthodoxy, he may be clearly convicted of not knowing what he saith. For he says here that the Word of God "is both Son and God even before the Incarnation, moreover that in the last times He took the form of a servant." Tell me therefore, if I do not seem to thee to say what is meet, Who is it now that is said to be made man? and what dost thou say that being made man is? who is he that took the servant's form? and how was it taken by him? That in saying therefore that a man was made man, you will display as worthy of ridicule your own understanding, how can one doubt? for he that is man by nature, how will he be made what he was, and pass as though to somewhat else, in respect I mean of nature? that which in its own nature is not free, how will it be said to have become bond, as though it were not so at the beginning? Hence to have been made man, will not pertain unto a man, far from it, and to take the form of a servant, belongs not to him who even at the beginning has the measure of bondservice, but to Him rather Who being not man by Nature, is believed to have been made so, and Who being Lord of all as God, abased Himself in our condition, uniting to Himself Personally the human nature, and taking the form of the servant. For thus will that too be true which thou saidst, that "after the assumption, He cannot be called Son separately lest we teach the doctrine of two sons."

And the right and unperverted and straight-going path of doctrines, is this and no other. But he again who mentioned to us the being-made-man of the Word Which is forth of the Father, borne almost straightway unto forgetfulness of what he said, severs again into two the One, both in vile sort floating in feeblest ideas and using ever words untested, for he said, "But since he has been connected with Him, Who is in the beginning Son, Who was connected with him, he may not admit of severance, as regards the dignity of sonship, as regards dignity I say of sonship, not as regards the natures." Rightly, my friend, dost thou reject as unprofitable that which seems to be insecure, studiously has it been set before thee to use ever vigilant mode of speech. For lo, lo, severing the natures, thou gatherest them into union as regards the dignity of sonship. Sufficeth therefore unto true union in things by nature severed one from another, the sameness or identity of names and the dignity in respect of this? for thus too does it seem good to thee to say. Therefore since the name Christ, and moreover son and lord, have been given to others too as names common [to several] (for very many have been made christs and have been called sons and lords); they too will be as regards the dignity of sonship, both disseverable one from another and all of them one in respect of the union which you think was wrought in respect of Christ too. But a man such as we will be wholly distinct from the Word out of God: how therefore they have not been severed, how too there is one son, I cannot

conceive, unless we say that the human nature and the Word have come together by a true union.

But since one must, on account of these words of his, carry round the argument even unto absurdity, that on all sides he may be convicted of having thought not aright, come now, come, let us say this too. For if the dignity of sonship suffices unto union, since the Word Which is from forth Him is called and is Son of God the Father, and the name is common to many more, where is the harm (tell me) of saying that the rest too all of them have themselves been united with Him, in order that Emmanuel may have nought more than they? for the claim of the same names will (it seems) be contending with Him and be striving for equality, and the mode of connection will lie in bare and mere appellation or community of name. What then is being made man understood to be? what too the descent in the servant's form? for if the mode of the being made man is (according to him) a mere connection, and consist in the dignity only of sonship what is to hinder our saying that it has been effected in regard to all the rest too? But the friend of learning sees assuredly the uncomeliness of what is said. Whither therefore is he now borne off, distraught, unto things not lawful? by us shall be said to him what is uttered by Jeremiah's voice, *Thou waxedst weary in much journeying*, for he is *tossed to and fro borne about with every wind*, as saith the most wise Paul. Therefore receive the *anchor of the soul sure and stedfast, set thy feet upon a rock*. If thou sayest that the Word of God was made man, this will suffice to shew that He Who is above all the creation was made as we. He took the servant's form although He possessed freedom as God; for He was in equality with the Father, Who possesseth dominion over all. Cease to sever the natures after the union: for that one thing and another is the Divine Nature and the nature of man it will be fit to know, and needful I deem to those who are sound in mind (for they are parted one from another by incomparable differences), but in regard to Christ the Saviour of us all, do thou having brought them together into union true and of Person, reject severance, for thus wilt thou confess one Christ and Son and Lord.

But I know not how the inventor of feeble doctrines has made exceeding petty account of the fact of union, and thrusting away both it (as seems) and the might of the truth, hath gone again unto what liketh himself and saith, "Therefore is God the Word called Christ also, seeing that He hath His connection with Christ perpetual. And it is not possible for God the Word to work ought without the manhood; for it hath been accurately adjusted unto exact connection, not deification, as the wise ones of the neo-dogmatists say." When therefore he says that the Word from forth God the Father has been separately called Christ, as having connection with Christ, i. e., with another, how has he not idly prated in saying that after the assumption He cannot be so styled separately? since not as One is that conceived of by us which is said to have been accidentally connected with ought else, for two of a surety will be rightly conceived to be the things which come together, and not one, itself connected with itself. False speech therefore are his words, and in another sense are they idle talk: but WE after the union, though one name God the Word, conceive not of Him apart from His own flesh; though one say Christ, we recognize the Word Incarnate. What then is the mode of the connection which you speak of conceived to be? for if you say that the human nature has been united Personally with the Word That sprang forth from God, why (tell me) do you insult the Divine Flesh? albeit you refuse not to worship it, while the duty of being worshipped belongs only to the Divine and Ineffable Nature: but if you do not think that a true union took place, but call rather by the name of connection, the rank which consists in identity of name and in mere and only equality of style, why do you prate in solemn language, saying that he that is born of the woman has "been accurately adjusted unto exact connection," i. e., with the Word? for they

are synonymous one with another, son with son, and lord with lord, nor are the names a whit inferior one to another, and to inquire into any superiority in them is (I suppose) idle, for son than son *qua* son, hath neither greater nor less. You are therefore talking superfluously (clearly so) in saying that he has been "accurately adjusted unto exact connection." But to say that they have been accurately adjusted one to another will belong (as appears to me) not to things possessing an identity of name, but to those rather, which obtain the equality and likeness in every thing of things that are believed to be one. As for example we say that there hath been accurately adjusted unto exact correspondence to the form of such an one, either the son that is begotten from out him, or one might say his image: but as regards connection, how can things be conceived of and said to have been accurately adjusted?

But himself interpreted to us the force of connection: for "it is not possible (he says) that God the Word should do ought without the human nature." Likeminded therefore with one another and harmonious according to thee, and from common counsel advancing unto each action shall we believe the pair of sons spoken of by thee. How then are there not two christs and sons and lords? But you affirm (it is like) that the Word used His Body as an instrument. Yet if you say One Son and One Person, the Incarnate Person of the Word, He will not be an instrument of Deity, but rather will use as an instrument His own Body, just as a man's soul too does. Therefore confess One, not dividing the natures, at the same time knowing and holding, that of the flesh the count is one; of the Godhead again, that which beseems It alone: for we say that the flesh of the Word by no means became Godhead, but rather Divine, as being His own. For if the flesh of a man is called human, what hinders that that of God the Word should be called Divine? why then dost thou mock at the beauty of the Truth, telling us of the deification of the holy flesh, and all but casting in the teeth of those who have chosen to think aright, a god-making, albeit thyself sayest,

"In order therefore that it might be pointed out to the Magi too, Who this is That is worshipped by them, and to Whom the grace of the Holy Ghost led them----that it was not to a mere babe viewed by itself, but to a body connected ineffably with God."

§9. Since therefore he says that the body has been ineffably united to God, and that which is truly ineffable is beyond understanding and speech, true of a surety is the union or the (according to him) connection. For such things are ineffable, and of things that thus come together with one another one would not (I deem) know the mode. But if thou art able to say it, and deemest that thou canst declare the force of the connection, how is it any longer ineffable?

But I marvel that albeit he says that the Body has been connected with God and that ineffably, he does not say that it is His very own, in order that it might be conceived of as one with Him, but parts again into man and God, separately and apart, the One Christ and Lord Jesus, and feigns that he thinks aright, when he says,

"Yet not mere man is Christ (o accuser) but Man alike and God: had He been God alone, it had been right, of Apolinarius, to say, Why seek ye to kill Me, God, Who have told you the truth? This is He Who was encircled with the Thorny Crown, this He Who said, My God, My God, why forsookest Thou Me? this He Who endured the three days death, this do I worship with the Godhead as co-partner in the Divine sway."

§10. View now I pray again how he snatches at and puts around his own words the form of the truth (for "not mere man, says he, is Christ, but Man alike and God,") yet severs again and says that He is not One, and stupidly takes hold of something without foundation and constructs what pleases himself. For as though some one were saying that the Word had appeared to us upon earth bare and without flesh, and had conversed with us, and wrought His Divine signs, or that He was common man and that not the Word Himself has been made Man:---he says, "Not mere man is Christ, but God also." But WE, most excellent sir (will I say), even though we say that He is Man alike and God, do not speak thus as putting them apart, but rather knowing that the Same even before the Incarnation was Son and God and Word of the Father, and after it hath become man as we and been made flesh. But he asserting that He ought not to be conceived of as mere man but God and Man, allots the Thorny Crown and the rest of the Sufferings to man severally and apart, while he confesses that he worships this man with the Godhead, and yet greater impiety, as not being (it is like) truly God and Son, but co-partner in the sway of the Word. For that he clearly severs, his confession that he ought to be worshipped *along with* the Godhead will clearly shew. For that which is co-worshipped with other is altogether other than that with which it is co-worshipped. But WE are accustomed to worship Emmanuel with one worship, not severing from the Word the Body That was Personally united to Him.

But it is meet to investigate what the being "advocate of the Divine Sway" means. For did our Lord Jesus Christ Himself too like one of the holy Apostles and Evangelists preach to the world another christ or son and lord, as having the Divine Sway or Authority over all, and Himself too speak for the glory of another? albeit the choir of God's heralds proclaim to the world Jesus Christ who is forth of the seed of David according to the flesh, and the plan of our faith advances through our confession to Himward, and we are justified, believing not on a mere man like us, but on Him Who is by Nature and truly God. And the Gentiles indeed were living in the world *without God*, when they knew not Christ, as blessed Paul saith, but since they knew Him they have not remained in ignorance of Him Who is by Nature God. Let him therefore teach us Whose glory and sway it was that Christ spoke for, albeit of them that came to Him He demanded faith in Himself, and this faith in Him He attributed to the Father: and verily He said, *Believe in Me and in God believe*, and again, *He that believeth on Me believeth not on Me but on Him That sent Me, and he that seeth Me seeth Him That sent Me*.

But haply *to speak for* according to him may mean the same as *to speak as*: I concede, albeit the word has other meaning. Then how may man speak as God (according to thee) when enduring the contumelies of the Jews? For come let us view the speech befitting each. It will be meet for Him Who is in truth God by Nature to say, I am invisible, impalpable and superior to suffering, moreover Incorporeal, Life and Life-giving and above all as God: the other expounding to us his own nature how it is, will reasonably say, I am visible and palpable, passible, subject to decay and subject to God. Will then he who says such things speak as He That excels and is superior, as regards the count of His own Nature? how were this not an unlearned thing to say? for one surely will speak falsely, either that one or this. But in saying advocacy or speaking for, that it is nought else than to speak for another, you confess even against your will who tell us of connection and of One Christ and Lord: and severing them into two you worship them, yea rather you co-worship, and think that you are freeing the Church from the charge of god-making, yourself engoddening a man, and not saying One Son even though He be not conceived of apart from His own flesh: for then would you worship Him unblamed, and will know where you were, as it is written, going astray from the doctrines of the truth.

"But yea (saith he) he hath said to the leper, *I will, be thou cleansed*, and to the ruler of the synagogue's daughter, *Maid, arise*, and to the sea, *Peace, be still*, and herein was he a co-partner, for he uttered the Divine words whereby it was possible to achieve all things easily." Two then are they that command, and let us grant that the words on all matters belong to both. When then it says, *Why seek ye to kill me, a man which have told you the truth*, whose words (tell me) do you say that these be? or dost thou allot those to the Word, these to a man born of a woman as other than He? Where then wilt thou put the most holy Paul who says clearly, *But to us One God the Father out of Whom all things and we unto Him, and One Lord Jesus Christ through Whom all things and we through Him*. But he, over and over saying, "One Son and not one and other, nor yet Christ and a second christ," contends against his own words, and to two persons and distinct hypostases allots the expressions of the Divines and His own.

Yet not regardless of his own notions, he puts forth again,

"I venerate him as image of Almighty Godhead; for He *highly exalted Him and gave Him a Name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus Christ every knee should bow, of heavenly and earthly and beneath the earth and every tongue should confess Lord Jesus Christ*."

§11. And who again will be conceived of as he whom (as he supposes) he confesses he venerates and pretends to honour with likeness to God, save surely him whom he but now mentioned to us, calling him an advocate or co-worker of the Divine sway? whom he foolishly said ought to be co-worshipped with the Godhead, as son other and severally than the Word of God: he says that he has also been exalted by God the Father, that he moreover received *the Name which is above every name, that to him should both every knee bow, of heavenly and earthly and neath the earth and every tongue confess Lord Jesus Christ*.

If therefore the Father hath placed Him, being God by Nature, on high even before the here-mentioned exaltation: on investigating the mode of the intervening abasement, we shall find some wise Economy in regard to which dishonoured meanwhile, He had become again in the exaltation wherein He ever was, exaltation essentially inexistent and verily Proper to Him. If this be not so (as he deems and says) but He made some other than the Word of God, the man connected with Him, an object of worship by heaven and earth and those lower yet:----He hath engodded a man like us: no longer will He meetly blame us as though we desired to engod him that is not God, whereas one must fasten on God the Father Himself the charge of the transgression hereto pertaining. He that is studious for learning sees therefore in what direction his words burst forth, and the inventions of his untempered miscounsel at what a word they terminate. For WE say that the Son being by Nature God, i. e., the Word out of God the Father, descended unto voluntary emptying, ascended again with the flesh too unto the God-befitting Dignity of His inherent Excellence: for He is worshipped with flesh too, as being an object of worship even before it, for He was even yet by Nature God, both before the emptying and when He is said to endure the emptiness, made as we. But this man disdainng so august and spotless doctrines connecteth a man with God by mere outward accident, and is not ashamed to co-worship him as in equality of dignity and as one with another, and maintains (he says) that he received as somewhat unwonted and strange and as a matter of favour that to him *every knee should bow*, and besides that *every tongue should confess Lord Jesus Christ*. And shouldst thou say that he was made God by Nature, he hath blasphemed openly saying that the Nature of the Godhead is generate; and if not by Nature but he receive

the dignity of gift and from outside and by mere title, how is he not openly saying that we worship him who is not by Nature God? And together with us (it is like) the gravity of the spirits above too is in error. And the Father Himself is the beginning and plea to us of these things. How then will He yet find fault with them who have chosen to worship the creature rather than Himself? and why does He indict and punish those that have erred, if the error have been by the will of Himself, in exhibiting to us as an object of worship him who is not by Nature God?

But since citing here this word, I mean the one before us, that to Him *shall bow every knee and every tongue shall confess Lord Jesus Christ*, he (I know not how minded) pretermitted what remains and was of necessity added in order by the blessed Paul, come let us adding it say this, for *every tongue confesses Lord Jesus Christ to the glory of God the Father*. Hence if He be not by Nature God, but he says that on account of accidental connection, I mean with the Word out of God, he is worshipped both by ourselves and by the holy angels:----some mode of honour has been invented by the Father, so that the creature should be engodded along with Himself, and to no purpose has He displeasure against any for having done this: and if this thing were to His honour, how should He not deem worthy of recompense, praise and glory them who have chosen to do this?

But haply they will say this, How is it any honour to the Father that *every knee should bow to Emmanuel*?

Because the Word being by Nature God and out of Him, that is, out of His Essence, has been made flesh, and is worshipped (as I said) as One and Alone and Truly Son with His proper Flesh. And the Father is glorified as God, having Very Son Him who was begotten from forth His Essence, whom made flesh also He hath given for us, in order that He having suffered in the flesh might save all under Heaven, that *every one who believeth on Him should not perish but have everlasting life*, that every one *that seeth Him might see the Father*. Now that this too is to us verily a life-giving thing, the Son Himself hath shewn: for He said, *This is Life Eternal that they might know Thee, the Only Very God and Jesus Christ whom Thou sentest*.

And this and none other is the way to the right and most unerring line of thought, but he utterly confounding every thing says,

"Because of the wearer I reverence the worn, because of the hidden I worship him that is seen."

§12. View again (I pray) how he every where shuns the union and fears the truth and refuses the rightness of the Divine doctrines. Not other than the worn was He who weareth, but rather the same conceived of in concurrence of Godhead and manhood, and One and Alone in truth Son of God the Father. Worship therefore the Word out of God as One with His own Flesh. For tell me, if I do not seem to thee to think aright, thrusting aside as feeble thy slow speech herein. For suppose one should choose to say of any man such as we are or of any one of the kings of the earth, Because of the king's soul I reverence his body, because of the hidden I worship him that is seen, would not one straightway chide him and say, O sir what are you doing? one man surely is the Ruler, even though he be evidently compounded of two, soul I mean and body. Why then are you idly blabbing to us, speaking of a wearer and a worn, a hidden and an apparent, and confessing that you co-worship as one with another and dishonouring the mode of union, whereas the God-inspired Scripturs reveals to us One Christ

and Lord, the Word out of God the Father with His own Body? Knowest thou not that He healed in Jerusalem the blind from his birth, afterward finding him in the temple, He engrafted into him a firm and stablished faith in Himself? for He came to him and asked, *Dost THOU believe on the Son of God?* and when to this he cried out, *Who is He, Lord, that I might believe on Him?* He again said, *Thou hast both seen Him and it is He that talketh with thee.* Thou seest how He hath shewn him not the wearer, not the hidden within, but rather Himself as One with the flesh? And verily the wise John says, *That Which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we viewed and our hands handled, of the Word of Life.* Albeit the Godhead is impalpable, yet the Word has been made palpable through His own flesh; invisible by Nature, He was yet manifest through the Body; but Thou again completely severest and dealest subtilly with the truth, parting the natures, uniting (as you say) the worship. But if you part the natures, along with them will diverge the natural properties too of either, the count of their difference will speed apart: hence two are they confessedly.

But tell me who ask, what is it that severs the natures one from another and what will be the mode of their difference. You will (I suppose) surely answer that one thing by nature is man or the manhood, another God or the Godhead: and the one exalted incomparably above the other, and it as much inferior as is man less than God. How then (tell me) dost thou deem right to honour with one worship things of so unlike nature and parted, as regards their mode of being, by incomparable differences? For would you, if you put about a horse a man's glory, be doing anything praiseworthy? would you not rather be insulting the superior, dragging down the better nature into dishonour?

But he has invented something clever in his defence, for he subjoins:

"Not by itself God is that which was formed in the womb, not by itself God that which was formed forth of the Spirit, not by itself God that which was buried in the tomb; for so should we have been man-worshippers and very worshippers of the dead. But since God is in that which is assumed, from that which assumeth is the assumed co-named God, as connected with the assumer."

§13. Lo again is he who every where telleth us of connection, and feareth the charge of man-worship, caught in the act of being a man-worshipper, and is holden in the meshes of his own mis-counsel and is detected falling into a reprobate mind. 'For (says he) that which is born from the womb is not by itself God.' How I marvel at thy shrewdness and thy so subtle mind: for who ever is there who hath dared to say this? or who that knows not that *that which is born of the flesh is flesh?* yet was it the own flesh of the Word and He is conceived of as one with it, just as we said but now that the soul of man too is one with his own body. If therefore one should choose say of us too, The body by itself is not man, would not such an one reasonably be called superfluous in his words and a random talker? for none will deny that the body by itself is not man, but it will be rather called the body of a man: natheless one will not severing them asunder and putting soul and body apart say that the body is co-named with the soul in order to signify a single man, for such a speech would not have been made orderly but would rather be replete with unlearning; but on bringing both together by physical union ²⁷ unto the condition of one man, he will then style him a man, and will not in this way seem to say what is paltry and uncomely. One must therefore if one would be in all wise and sensible say, A body which is from forth a woman, and confess that conjoined by personal union to the Word, it has rendered the Same, God and Man, One Christ and Son and Lord.

But now premitting this, falling quite away from the straight road he thinks.....the perverted way, and proclaims unto us two gods: one, as if by Nature and in truth, the Word forth of God the Father, and other than He, him who is co-named with Him. For just as no one of us would be said to live (for example) with himself alone, but rather he would live with another, and if any one were to say that any of the kings of the earth co-reigned with himself, such an one would reasonably incur ridicule, and would be blabbing, putting and saying what belonged to one only, as though [he were speaking] of two: just so is it exceeding lack of understanding to suppose that *to be co-named* can have place in respect of one only. For they will surely be two; and the one is God by Nature, the other having (it seems) the mere being co-named [as something] from without and accruing to him, is exhibited to us as a new god. Does therefore He That is by Nature and truly God of all lie in saying to us, *If thou wilt hearken unto Me, there shall be no new god be in thee, neither shalt thou worship an alien god?* Then how have we worshipped Christ and how to Him shall every knee bow? how dost thou confess that thou veneratest Him? albeit thou fearest (as thou saidst) to be called a man-worshipper.

But he has as he thinks some clever answer to this, "he is co-named god as connected with the assumer:" how was he assumed (told) or what the mode of the connection? If therefore by true union, I mean of Person, cease dividing what has been united; for seasonably (I deem) by us too shall be said to thee who art severing the inseverable, *What, therefore God joined together let not man put asunder*. But if thou say that the assumption or the connection is extraneous and of accident, how knowest thou not that in us too is God and WE are connected to Him relatively and have been made *partakers of His Divine Nature*? yea the Divine-uttering David singeth, *My soul is fast joined after Thee*. Shall WE too therefore be co-named with God by Nature gods according to him, to us too shall every knee bow? What God the Father hath enjoined to the spirits above let the Divine-uttering Paul come forward and teach; *For when* (saith he) *He bringeth the First-begotten into the world He saith, And let all the Angels of God worship Him*. Since therefore herein thy wise word has not been added, but He has enjoined rather that He should be worshipped as of a surety One and not one along with another: who is He who is worshipped by the Angels, albeit the Divine Scripture calls Him First-born? We say that the Word out of God the Father has been called First-born albeit He is God by Nature and Only-Begotten Son and not reckoned with the creature, as far as regards Godhead, because He was made Man and *First-born among many brethren*.

One therefore is He Who is worshipped by the spirits above, the Word forth of God the Father with His own flesh: for then did He bear Him and, as having *the preeminence in all things*, is He conceived of as First-born. And the God-inspired Scriptures wholly proclaim One Christ and Son and Lord: but this too-curious man says Two and he is not ashamed to add a worshipped man to the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity: for he says again,

"But this kinsman after the flesh of Israel, man according to what is manifest, begotten according to Paul's voice of the seed of David, is by connection Almighty God" and then adds, "Hear Paul proclaiming both, he confesses the man first and then deifies what is manifest by connection with God, that none may suspect the Christian of being a man-worshipper. Keep we therefore unconfused the connection of the natures, confess we One God, reverence we the man who is co-worshipped by a Divine connection along with the Almighty God."

§14. If therefore on naming Man thou knowest that He is with this God by Nature, it is well and I will stop: but if severing the natures, not merely in respect of knowing which is the human, which again the Divine, but rather parting them from their concurrence unto unity, confessedly thou art a man-worshipper, and it shall be said to thee by us, *Thou shalt eat the fruit of thy labours*: and being hard and spurning admonition, go alone on the perverted way. But WE, tracking the pious and blameless path of the holy fathers, instructed full well in the writings of the Apostles and Evangelists, will honour together with God the Father and the Holy Ghost, with one worship, the One Lord Jesus Christ, through Whom and with Whom to God the Father be glory with the Holy Ghost unto ages of ages.